

## D.C. Cook 1 1Q/2005 Plant Inspection Findings

---

### Initiating Events

---

### Mitigating Systems

**Significance:**  Jun 30, 2004

Identified By: NRC

Item Type: NCV NonCited Violation

#### **Inadequate Acceptance Criteria for Heat Exchanger Tube Blockage**

A finding of very low safety significance and an associated Non-Cited Violation of 10 CFR 50, Appendix B, Criterion XI, "Test Control," was identified for the failure to include adequate acceptance limits in the procedure for inspecting and cleaning the component cooling water system heat exchangers. This finding was more than minor because, if left uncorrected, the issue could become a more significant safety concern. Specifically, the testing acceptance limit deficiencies could have designated a component cooling water heat exchanger as acceptable, when the heat exchanger heat removal capability had actually degraded below its design requirements. The issue was of very low safety significance since the licensee had recently cleaned all four component cooling water system heat exchangers and operability limits were not challenged.

Corrective actions to address this issue included revising testing acceptance limits to adequately define what constituted a blocked heat exchanger tube.

Inspection Report# : [2004006\(pdf\)](#)

---

### Barrier Integrity

---

### Emergency Preparedness

---

### Occupational Radiation Safety

**Significance:**  Dec 17, 2004

Identified By: NRC

Item Type: NCV NonCited Violation

#### **Failure To Promptly Correct Radiological Survey Maps**

A finding of very low safety significance was identified by the inspectors when licensee personnel failed to adequately address repetitive radiological posting errors. The issue was more than minor since it was associated with the Program and Process attribute of the Occupational Radiation Safety cornerstone and adversely affected the cornerstone objective of ensuring the adequate protection of worker health and safety from exposure to radiation.

The finding was of very low safety significance since the issue did not directly impact As Low As Reasonably Achievable (ALARA) planning or work controls, was not associated with an overexposure or a substantial potential for an overexposure, or compromise the licensee's ability to assess dose. As part of the licensee's immediate corrective actions, areas with survey maps which were outdated were immediately updated to reflect the most recent survey results. One Non-Cited Violation of Technical Specification 6.8.1 was identified.

Inspection Report# : [2004014\(pdf\)](#)

---

### Public Radiation Safety

## Physical Protection

[Physical Protection](#) information not publicly available.

---

## Miscellaneous

**Significance:** N/A Dec 17, 2004

Identified By: NRC

Item Type: FIN Finding

### **Problem Identification and Resolution**

The inspectors concluded that the licensee's corrective action program was adequately identifying, prioritizing, evaluating and resolving problems. The conclusion of inspectors, largely born out in the opinions of the licensee staff who were interviewed, was that the identification of issues was good, but that problem resolution, though improved, needed further improvement. Licensee efforts through a Recovery Plan appeared to have a positive effect on problem resolution and the issues identified by the inspectors were of very low significance. The inspectors also concluded, based on the activities performed, that there was no evidence to support that management did not foster an environment where workers felt free to raise safety issues.

Inspection Report# : [2004014\(pdf\)](#)

**Significance:** SL-III Jun 04, 2004

Identified By: NRC

Item Type: VIO Violation

### **Failure to Provide Complete and Accurate Information to the NRC Which Impacted A Licensing Decision.**

D. C. Cook management personnel informed NRC Region III by letter dated March 24, 2004, that one senior reactor operator had a pre-existing medical condition (since 1996) that required the presence of another qualified individual (i.e., "no solo") when performing licensed duties and requested a "no solo" license restriction for the individual. The letter from the company physician also described a medication the individual was taking for the medical condition. The medical condition described by the physician was considered a disqualifying condition in accordance with American National Standards Institute/American Nuclear Society (ANSI/ANS)-3.4 - 1983, "American National Standard Medical Certification and Monitoring of Personnel Requiring Operator Licenses for Nuclear Power Plants." On December 28, 1999, the licensee provided information to the NRC regarding the medical status of the same individual applying for a renewal of the individual's senior reactor operator license with no recommendation for a "no solo" license. The individual's license was renewed by the NRC on February 1, 2000, based on the information provided by the licensee on December 28, 1999. Again, the medical condition was considered a disqualifying condition in accordance with ANSI/ANS-3.4 - 1983, and should have been reported to the NRC on NRC Form 396 for the renewal of the applicant's license requesting a "no solo" restriction on the individual's license. Therefore, the information provided to the NRC on December 28, 1999, was material to the NRC licensing action. [Note: The information concerning the individual's specific medical condition is considered medical privacy information under 10 CFR 2.390(2)(6) and is not specifically discussed here.]

As noted above, Region III received a letter from the D. C. Cook Nuclear Power Plant dated March 24, 2004, requesting a "no solo" license restriction for the individual. Region III received another letter from the D. C. Cook Nuclear Power Plant dated May 20, 2004, notifying the NRC that the recommendation of the "no solo" license condition for the individual not be implemented. The letter stated that upon further review of the individual's medical records, the company physician determined that the individual met ANSI/ANS-3.4 - 1983 to work as an operator in a multi-person facility; therefore, no license condition for solo operation was required. The NRC's medical officer again determined on May 26, 2004, that the operator required a "no solo" restriction to the operator's license. Since NRC intervention was required to identify the requirement for the operator to have a "no solo" restriction, this apparent violation was considered NRC identified.

Because the issue affected the NRC's ability to perform its regulatory function, it was evaluated with the traditional enforcement process. The finding was determined to be of low safety significance because the operator had not acted in a solo capacity prior to the license being amended. However, the regulatory significance was important because the incorrect information was provided under a signed statement to the NRC and impacted a licensing decision for the individual. The issue was preliminarily determined to be an apparent violation of 10 CFR 50.9.

AV Closed. Notice of Violation Issued September 29, 2004.

Inspection Report# : [2004007\(pdf\)](#)

Last modified : June 17, 2005